

## REMARKS

In contrast to the teaching of the two references cited by the Examiner, Applicants have invented a way to make a writing on transparent substrate to appear brilliant and illuminated by forming protrusions (made of the same material as the substrate) on one side while maintaining a flat viewing surface on the other side.

In the previous Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 8, 9, and 11 under 35 USC 102(b) in view of US Pat 3256626 to Stoffel. And rejected claim 10, under 35 USC 103 in view of Stoffel and US patent No. 455666 to Housman. In particular, the Examiner asserted that Stoffel discloses a transparent plastic member having the features of Applicants' invention as defined by claims 8, 9, and 11. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First Stoffel does not disclose a transparent member. In fact, Stoffel discloses that the article may be colored. See Col. 1, lines 46-48.

Second, Stoffel does not disclose protrusions arranged on the rear side of a member that are visible from a flat front side. Stoffel discloses the opposite; it clearly shows in Figure 1 protrusions on the viewing surface. And at Column 2, lines 13-24, Stoffel states clearly and unambiguously that the protrusions forming the indicia project outwardly from the front, viewing surface of the sheet. In contrast, presently pending claims 8-11 require that the protrusions project from one surface and be viewed from a flat surface opposite the surface on which the protrusions are disposed.

If the Examiner wishes to maintain her rejection in view of Stoffel, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out where Stoffel teaches a flat viewing surface and an opposite surface having projections. Applicants note that Figure 2, which is a rear view, does not show the indicia described by Stoffel. The indicia is visible in Figure 1 and Figure 1 clearly shows indicia and a border or frame protruding from the front surface, which is the viewing surface. In Figure 4, the protrusions are shown on the bottom surface, thus making the bottom surface the viewing surface. Therefore the flat surface (11) in Figure 4 must be the rear surface, which is a non-viewing surface. Indeed, nothing in Stoffel suggests viewing the indicia from the opposite surface.

Applicants also respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that claim 10 is obvious in view of the cited patents. Each and every element of the claimed invention is not

present in the combined teachings of the cited art. In particular, the combination of the two references fails to disclose a protrusion on a rear surface that is visible when viewing the flat surface. And the combination fails to disclose or suggest making protrusions from the same transparent material as the flat member. First, as discussed above, Stoffel does not disclose a transparent member having protrusions on the non-viewing surface. Second, Houseman does not disclose a flat viewing surface and a writing on the opposite surface created by protrusions made from a transparent material. Housman discloses that decorations be formed by creating sockets in a substrate of a plastically deformable material and placing metal leaf in the socket—which of course means that the protrusions are not formed of a transparent material as metal leaf is not transparent. Moreover, this, of course also means that the viewing surface is the surface having the socket and is therefore not flat. According to Housman, it is a double layer of metal leaf in the sockets that assumes a brilliant appearance. Thus, the references in combination do not show each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because the claims that are currently pending require the protrusions to be made from the same material as the transparent member and that they be visible from a flat surface opposite the surface from which they protrude, they are not anticipated or obvious in view of the cited references. Housman requires a metal leaf be applied to indentations to create brilliance when viewed from the surface in which the indentations or sockets are created. Therefore it is the leaf that forms the marking. And clearly the viewing surface in Housman is the surface having the sockets because there would be no point in applying metal leaf to the sockets if they were not visible from the viewing surface. Likewise, Stoffel discloses the use of a molded plastic on a sheet member to form protrusions on the viewing surface. If the invention in Stoffel used the same material for the protrusions as the substrate, applicants assert that the sheet member would melt during the molding process and thus, the sheet must be different than the material forming the protrusions. Thus, even if the two references are combined, the combined teaching would suggest only protrusions on a viewing surface and metal leafing on the viewing surface to create brilliance. They do not teach that an illumination effect can be created by forming protrusions on a front of transparent member when viewing the member from a flat rear surface.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the present amendment presents no new issues or new matter and that all claims are in condition for allowance

The Examiner should feel free to contact the applicants' Attorney by telephone if there are any questions concerning this amendment or application.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee that may be due in connection with this paper or this application or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 14-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

October 28, 2003



Marc A. Began Reg. No. 48,829  
Novo Nordisk Pharmaceuticals, Inc.  
100 College Road West  
Princeton NJ 08540  
(609) 919-7829

23650

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE